UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/533,393	04/28/2005	Kazumasa Morichika	05276/LH	9061
	7590	EXAMINER		
220 Fifth Avenu		DEBROW, JAMES J		
16TH Floor NEW YORK, NY 10001-7708			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2176	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/23/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/533,393 MORICHIKA, KAZ		MASA	
Examiner	Art Unit		
JAMES J. DEBROW	2176		

	JAMES J. DEBROW	2176				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED <u>14 August 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS AF	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	ALLOWANCE.				
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	the same day as filing a Notice of eplies: (1) an amendment, affidavi al (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request			
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.					
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adno event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE ).	g date of the final rejection FIRST REPLY WAS FII	n. LED WITHIN TWO			
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as			
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS</li> </ol>	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the				
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b	out prior to the data of filing a brief	will not be entered be	201100			
<ul><li>(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further cor</li><li>(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below</li></ul>	sideration and/or search (see NO¯ v);	ΓE below);				
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett	er form for appeal by materially re	ducing or simplifying tl	ne issues for			
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	orresponding number of finally reig	acted claims				
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	orresponding number of finally reje	cied ciairris.				
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12  5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		mpliant Amendment (l	PTOL-324).			
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).		timely filed amendmer	t canceling the			
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prove The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		I be entered and an e	xplanation of			
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-13</u> .						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE						
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>						
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a			
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ed.			
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.</li> </ol>	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:			
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)						
	/Doug Hutton/					
	Supervisory Patent Examiner Technology Center 2100					

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Applicant argues Olson et al does not at all disclose or suggest picking up a screen image and storing and saving the picked-up image as data in the presentation card.

## The examiner disagrees

Olson teaching storing a presentation card may be a flash memory card (col. 4, lines 23). It has been established and is well known in the art that it is possible to store/save information/images to a flash card. Further, it a presentation is stored (prestored) on a presentation card (memory card), then it is obvious that the presentation can be saved to the memory card.

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See In re Keller, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); In re Merck & Co., 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).